

10/664,625

03W028

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are pending. Claim 28 has been amended for clarification, without intended change in scope.

Prior Art Rejections

The various prior art rejections are discussed below in the same general order in which they are made in the Action.

Girod

Claims 1-6, 8-10, 19-22, and 26-35 stand rejected under 35 USC 102(e) as anticipated by Girod, U.S. Patent No. 6,687,506 ("Girod"). Claims 7, 15-18, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Girod. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Girod discloses use of a jamming device 1 with an adjustable directional antenna 2, to prevent some or all communication with mobile telephones in a specific enclosed protected space 7, such as a meeting room. Girod discloses a number of types of antennas for the directional antenna 2, including parabolic antennas, Yagi antennas, and dihedral antennas. Col. 5, lines 18-22. Girod also discloses that multiple structures that include radiating elements and reflecting surfaces may be placed within the volume to be protected. Girod discloses preventing communication with mobile telephones in the enclosed space by transmitting a jamming signal over a range of frequencies. Col. 3, lines 1-2; Fig. 7. The transmitting of the jamming signal may be continuous, col. 4, lines 22-23, or may be intermittent, being activated only when a mobile telephone is initiating an incoming or outgoing call, col. 4, lines 7-16 and 64-67. Girod discloses transmission of a false local BCCH as a jamming signal. Col. 5, lines 60-62. In another configuration, Girod's device transmits a neutralization code when the system detects that a radio telephone is transmitting signals. Col. 4, lines 24-44; Fig. 8. Girod does not

10/664,625

03W028

explicitly explain what a "neutralization code" is, but it appears that it may be the superposition of an unidentifiable radio signal onto an individual code of a radio telephone, as described at col. 2, lines 4-14. Girod also discloses use of a concave reflecting surface *r*, which is used in conjunction with a radiating element *e*, coupled to a jammer apparatus BR. Col. 5, lines 26-29; Fig. 15. Girod does not disclose use of a conductive shield separate from an antenna of its jamming device, does not disclose receiving a response to a transmitted pseudo base signal to detect the presence of a telephone device, and does not disclose use of a frequency scanner that stops scanning and maintains transmission at a given frequency when a device is detected.

Claim 1 recites a detector for detecting telephone-activated devices that includes, *inter alia*, a conductive shield having an open end for placing objects that may contain a telephone-activated device, at least in proximity thereto. Girod does not teach or suggest a telephone-activated-device detector that includes a conductive shield, separate from its transmitter (antenna). In some portions of the Action, for instance page 2, sections of Girod related to antennas are cited as teaching the conductive shield, while in other portions of the Action, such as page 3, a section of Girod relating to Girod's concave reflecting surface *r* are cited as teaching the conductive shield. Neither of these parts of Girod's device teaches or suggests the claimed conductive shield. The antennas are of course parts of Girod's transmitter, which is a separately claimed feature in claim 1. As to Girod's concave reflecting surface *r*, Girod's only mention of it is as part of a housing, also containing a radiating element *e*, apparently to bring the jamming signal closer to any telephone devices in the protected space 7. Girod provides no indication that the concave reflecting surface *r* has "an open end for placing objects that may contain a telephone-activated device, at least in proximity thereto," as is recited in claim 1. To the contrary, Fig. 15 of Girod shows the emitter *e* as fully outside and away from the concave reflecting surface *r*. Placing an object in or near an open end of the concave reflecting surface 12 would involve placing the object

10/664,625

03W028

between the emitter e and the concave reflecting surface r. Nor does Girod suggest placing objects in or near a conductive shield, since Girod's concern is creating a protected space, rather than examining individual objects for telephone-activated devices. Since Girod does not teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1, claims 1-10 and 15-21 are patentable over Girod.

Some of the dependent claims are patentable over Girod for additional reasons. Claim 2 recites that at least part of the transmitter is within the conductive shield, claim 3 recites that at least part of the receiver is within the conductive shield, and claim 4 recites transmitting and receiving antennas that are at least partially within the conductive shield. Girod does not teach or suggest the additional features of these claims, at least because Girod's emitter e, which might correspond to a transmitter or antenna, is fully outside Girod's concave reflecting surface r. Therefore claims 2-4 are patentable over Girod for additional reasons.

Dependent claims 15 and 16 specify maximum weights of the device. These claims are rejected as obvious on the basis that Applicants have not disclosed that the weights "provide[] an advantage, [are] used for a particular purpose, or solve[] a stated problem." To the contrary, the advantage is stated plainly in paragraph [0032] of the application (where the recited weights are also mentioned): "The detector 10 may be a lightweight detector suitable for carrying by an operator from place to place." It would not have been obvious to make Girod's jammer weigh 5 pounds or less. Since Girod's jammer is designed to protect a fixed enclosed space, there would be no special need to make it lightweight, since portability is not an issue. Thus claims 15 and 16 are patentable over Girod for another reason.

Dependent claim 17 recites that the detector is a portable detector having at least one handle. While Applicants readily admit that handles are not new, it is not obvious to attach a handle to just anything. Girod's jamming device, for preventing mobile telephone communication in a specified enclosed space, is an example of the sort of

10/664,625

03W028

device that it would not be obvious to attach a handle to. Girod's device is used in a fixed location and is not moved during use, so there is no advantage to making it portable. In addition, Girod's system appears to have multiple parts, spaced far apart, making it impractical to lift with a handle. Finally, there is no indication that the weight of Girod's system is such that it can be picked up, even if it did have a handle. Thus it would not have been obvious to make Girod's jamming system portable by attaching a handle, and claim 17 is patentable for another reason.

Claim 22 recites a detector for detecting telephone-activated devices that includes, among other things, a transmitter for generating and transmitting a pseudo base station signal corresponding to a base station for a telephone-activated device, and a receiver for receiving and detecting a response signal transmitted by the telephone-activated device, wherein the transmitter includes a signal-generating unit coupled to a frequency scanner adapted to successively transmit signals, scanning multiple possible base station frequencies, wherein the frequency scanner is coupled to circuitry adapted to stop the scanning when the receiver detects a telephone-activated device, while maintaining transmission at the frequency at which the transmitter was transmitting when the receiver detected the telephone-activated device. Girod does not teach or suggest a receiver that receives and detects a response signal to a transmitted pseudo base station signal, and does not teach or suggest circuitry that stops frequency scanning when a device is detected. The Action cites certain passages of Girod that refer to intermittent jamming. Intermittent jamming is not the same as stopping frequency scanning and maintaining transmission at a given frequency when a device is detected. Nor does intermittent jamming suggest circuitry that performs this function. Girod's intermittent jamming is triggered by a detection of a mobile phone making an outgoing call or receiving an incoming call. Col. 4, lines 12-15 and 24-35; col. 5, lines 12-14. Girod does not teach or suggest detecting the presence of mobile telephones by looking for responses to pseudo base station signals. Nor does Girod teach or suggest

10/664,625

03W028

stopping frequency scanning transmissions when a device is detected. Because Girod is concerned with preventing mobile telephone use in an enclosed volume where multiple phones would be present, it would not be expected for Girod's device to cease scanning for the presence of other devices to focus on interdicting communication with a single device. Since Girod does not teach or suggest all the recited features of claim 22, claims 22-25 are patentable over Girod.

Dependent claims 23-25 are patentable over Girod for the additional reasons discussed above with regard to claims 15-17.

Claim 26 recites a method of detecting telephone-activated devices that includes, *inter alia*, for each of multiple possible base station frequencies, transmitting a pseudo base station signal from a transmitter of a telephone-activated device detector to an object, and checking, with a receiver of the detector, for receipt of signals from the object indicating the presence of a telephone-activated device. Although Girod does disclose transmission of a false local BCCH as a jamming signal, Girod does not teach or suggest checking for receipt of response signals from the object indicating presence of a telephone-activated device. Nothing in Girod provides any indication that the false local BCCH is used for detection, rather than for jamming of already detected mobile telephones. Accordingly, Girod does not teach or suggest the features of claim 26, and claims 26-35 are therefore patentable over Girod.

Dependent claims 28 and 29 recite the interdiction device sending control signals to a telephone-activated device to cause the telephone-activated device to execute an internal function to change its functionality. Two examples are given in paragraph [0038] of the present application: control signals that cause the telephone-activated device to shut itself off, or that cause the telephone-activated device to disable itself from being able to receiving incoming messages. Nothing in Girod teaches or suggests transmission of such control signals. BCCH signals, disclosed in the section of Girod cited in the Action, are not the recited control signals. Thus claims 28 and 29 are

10/664,625

03W028

patentable over Girod for additional reasons.

Combination of Girod and Oura

Claims 11-14 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over Girod in view of Oura, EP 0 881 850 ("Oura"). Oura does not make up for the failure of Girod to teach or suggest all of the features of claim 1. For this reason alone claims 11-14 are patentable over Girod and Oura, either alone or in combination.

Conclusion

For at least the foregoing reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of the claims is respectfully requested, in which event this application would be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

No fees are believed due with the filing of this paper. In the event any fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 18-0988 (Charge No. RAYTP0230US).

Respectfully submitted,
RENNER, OTTO, BOISSELLE & SKLAR, LLP

By


Jonathan A. Platt
Reg. No. 41,255

1621 Euclid Avenue
Nineteenth Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 621-1113
(216) 621-6165 (fax)